

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 112140

62
ORIGIN NEA-12

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 IO-13 SSO-00 SS-15 RSC-01 L-03 /045 R

DRAFTED BY NEA: ALATHERTON: KM

6/9/73 29464

APPROVED BY NEA: ALATHERTON

IO - MFHERZ

----- 050254

O 092101 Z JUN 73

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY TEHRAN IMMEDIATE

CONFIDENTIAL STATE 112140

STADIS//////////

E. O.: 11652: GDS
TAGS: PFOR, UN
SUBJECT: DRAFT STATEMENT FOR AMB SCALI

FOR ASST SECY SISCO FROM HERZ AND ATHERTON

1. FOLLOWING IS FIRST DRAFT OF STATEMENT FOR AMB SCALI
TO MAKE IN SC MIDDLE EAST DEBATE. AT SCALI'S REQUEST,
WE HAVE UNDERTAKEN TO GET DRAFT TO HIM MONDAY AFTERNOON
TO GIVE HIM OPPORTUNITY SUBMIT HIS COMMENTS AND/ OR
SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT'S CONSIDERATION
BEFORE HE SPEAKS, PROBABLY IN LATTER HALF OF WEEK. WOULD
THEREFORE APPRECIATE ANY COMMENTS AND/ OR CHANGES YOU
MAY HAVE IF POSSIBLE BY MONDAY MORNING WASHINGTON TIME.

2. BEGIN TEXT: MR. PRESIDENT, MY GOVERNMENT VIEWS
THIS MEETING OF THE COUNCIL AS AN OPPORTUNITY. I WANT TO
EMPHASIZE THAT AT THE OUTSET. WHILE THE COUNCIL HAS BEEN
CONVENED MANY TIMES IN RECENT YEARS TO HEAR THE COMPLAINTS
OF ONE SIDE AGAINST THE OTHER IN THE ARAB/ ISRAELI DISPUTE,
IT HAS NOT MET TO REVIEW THE PROBLEM AS A WHOLE SINCE
NOVEMBER 1967. WE SHOULD SO COMPORT OURSELVES AT THIS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 112140

MEETING THAT WE WILL NOT LOSE THIS OPPORTUNITY.

3. IN THE MORE THAN FIVE AND ONE- HALF YEARS SINCE THE
COUNCIL LAST DEALT WITH THE ISSUE IN A COMPREHENSIVE

MANNER, MANY WORDS HAVE BEEN SPOKEN AND MANY RESOLUTIONS PASSED, BUT THE PROBLEM IS STILL WITH US. IN SOME WAYS, THE PROBLEM IS MORE DIFFICULT TODAY THAN IT WAS FIVE AND ONE- HALF YEARS AGO. TIME HAS A WAY OF GIVING AN AURA OF PERMANENCE TO WHAT ONCE SEEMED TRANSITORY. THIS MEETING SHOULD BE FIRST OF ALL, THEREFORE, AN OPPORTUNITY TO REAFFIRM THAT THE COUNCIL DOES NOT CONSIDER THE PRESENT SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST EITHER NATURAL OR PERMANENT. IT IS NEITHER, AND WE SHOULD LEAVE NO DOUBT ABOUT THAT.

4. TIME ALSO HAS A WAY OF SUBTLY ALTERING THE WAY WE PERCEIVE PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTIONS. THIS MEETING IS THEREFORE AN OPPORTUNITY AS WELL TO RE- ASSESS OUR PERCEPTIONS, TO SEE WHETHER THEY HAVE CHANGED OVER THESE PAST FIVE AND ONE- HALF YEARS, AND WHETHER PERHAPS THIS HAS BEEN IN WAYS THAT ARE NOT CONDUCIVE TO THE PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT WE ALL SEEK. THIS MEETING SHOULD BE AN OPPORTUNITY, IN SHORT, TO RECAPTURE THE HOPE AND TO RE- AFFIRM THE RESOLVE WHICH INSPIRED THE COUNCIL, ON NOVEMBER 22, 1967, TO GIVE ITS UNANIMOUS APPROVAL TO RESOLUTION 242. THAT DECISION WAS RECOGNIZED AT THE TIME AS A LANDMARK IN THE LONG HISTORY OF THIS PROBLEM IN THE UNITED NATIONS. IT REMAINS A LANDMARK TODAY.

5. RESOLUTION 242 REFLECTED A DECISION OF THE COUNCIL THAT, AFTER EIGHTEEN YEARS OF ARMISTICE AND THREE WARS WITH THEIR TOLL OF HUMAN TRAGEDY AND MATERIAL LOSS AND THEIR THREAT TO WORLD PEACE, THE TIME HAD COME TO MOVE EXPEDITIOUSLY TOWARD A JUST AND LASTING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. THE RESOLUTION RECOGNIZED THAT SUCH A PEACE MUST BE BASED ON A JUST SETTLEMENT NOT ONLY OF THE PROBLEMS ARISING OUT OF THE HOSTILITIES OF JUNE 1967, BUT ALSO OF THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE ARAB/ ISRAELI CONFLICT AS THEY HAVE EXISTED NOW FOR OVER A QUARTER OF A CENTURY.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 112140

6. WHAT WERE THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS WITH WHICH WE BEGAN THE SEARCH FOR PEACE IN 1967?

7. FIRST, IT IS IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER THAT THE COUNCIL, IN CALLING FOR A CEASEFIRE TO END THE FIGHTING IN JUNE 1967, DID NOT ADDRESS THE QUESTION OF WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE OUTBREAK OF THAT FIGHTING, NOR DID IT CALL FOR UNCONDITIONAL ISRAELI WITHDRAWAL.

8. SECOND, IT IS IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER THE NATURE AND ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF RESOLUTION 242 AS THEY WERE GENERALLY UNDERSTOOD AT THE TIME. THE RESOLUTION WAS

THE RESULT OF COMPROMISE BY ALL CONCERNED, AND THIS MEANS THAT ANY SETTLEMENT BASED UPON IT MUST REFLECT

THAT SPIRIT OF COMPROMISE. RESOLUTION 242 DID NOT DEFINE THE TERMS OF A SETTLEMENT. IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE RESOLUTION ITSELF, IT DEFINED A SET OF " PROVISIONS AND PRINCIPLES" WHICH CONSTITUTE A FRAMEWORK FOR THE TERMS OF A FINAL SETTLEMENT. IT IS ONLY FAIR TO NOTE THAT THE TERMS TO BE NEGOTIABLE MUST THEREFORE BE CONSISTENT WITH THOSE PROVISIONS AND PRINCIPLES -- NOT JUST WITH SOME OF THEM BUT WITH ALL OF THEM TAKEN TOGETHER. IF THE TERMS OF A SETTLEMENT DO NOT MEET THAT TEST, THEY CANNOT IN OUR VIEW FORM PART OF THE JUST AND LASTING PEACE WE SEEK. TOO OFTEN, ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER HAS SOUGHT TO EMPHASIZE CERTAIN ELEMENTS OF RESOLUTION 242 WHILE IGNORING OTHERS.

9. WHAT ARE THE MAIN PROVISIONS AND PRINCIPLES OF RESOLUTION 242?

10. FIRST, IT EMPHASIZES IN ITS PREAMBLE " THE INADMISSIBILITY OF THE ACQUISITION OF TERRITORY BY WAR AND THE NEED TO WORK FOR A JUST AND LASTING PEACE IN WHICH EVERY STATE IN THE AREA CAN LIVE IN SECURITY." LET ME STATE UNEQUIVOCALLY THAT MY GOVERNMENT ENDORSES THAT PRINCIPLE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RESOLUTION AS A WHOLE.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 112140

11. SECOND, RESOLUTION 242 AFFIRMS THAT PEACE SHOULD INCLUDE THE APPLICATION OF TWO CO- EQUAL PRINCIPLES: ONE IS " WITHDRAWAL OF ISRAELI ARMED FORCES FROM TERRITORIES OCCUPIED" IN THE 1967 CONFLICT. MY GOVERNMENT OF COURSE ALSO ENDORSES THAT PRINCIPLE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RESOLUTION AS A WHOLE. BUT THE PRINCIPLE OF WITHDRAWAL CANNOT BE SEPARATED FROM THE NEXT BALANCING PARAGRAPH, WHICH AFFIRMS THE PRINCIPLE OF " TERMINATION OF ALL CLAIMS OR STATES OF BELLIGERENCY AND RESPECT FOR AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE SOVEREIGNTY, TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY, AND POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE OF EVERY STATE IN THE AREA AND THEIR RIGHT TO LIVE IN PEACE WITHIN SECURE AND RECOGNIZED BOUNDARIES FREE FROM THREATS OR ACTS OF FORCE."

12. THIRD, RESOLUTION 242 AFFIRMS THE NECESSITY FOR GUARANTEEING FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION AND FOR GUARANTEEING THE TERRITORIAL INVOLABILITY AND POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE OF EVERY STATE IN THE AREA. CLEARLY, THE SPECIFIC MEASURES BY WHICH THESE IMPORTANT INTERESTS OF THE PARTIES ARE TO BE GUARANTEED MUST BE PART OF THE DETAILED TERMS OF A FINAL SETTLEMENT. THEY MUST BE PART OF THE STRUCTURE OF PEACE.

13. FOURTH, RESOLUTION 242 AFFIRMS THE NECESSITY FOR

ACHIEVING A JUST SETTLEMENT OF THE REFUGEE PROBLEM. THAT, TOO, MUST CLEARLY BE PART OF THE STRUCTURE OF PEACE. MY GOVERNMENT HAS MADE CLEAR ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS OUR VIEW THAT NO STRUCTURE OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST CAN BE JUST AND LASTING IF IT DOES NOT MAKE PROVISION FOR THE LEGITIMATE ASPIRATIONS OF THE PALESTINIANS. IN OUR VIEW, IT IS FOR THE PARTIES TO WORK OUT WHAT THIS MEANS IN SPECIFIC TERMS, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT RELEVANT UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTIONS OVER THE YEARS, INCLUDING RESOLUTION 242.

14. FINALLY, RESOLUTION 242 CALLS FOR AGREEMENT. IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RESOLUTION, THIS CLEARLY MEANS AGREEMENT
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 112140

BETWEEN THE PARTIES CONCERNED, TO BE ACHIEVED WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL'S SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE, AMBASSADOR JARRING, TO WHOSE EFFORTS I WISH TO PAY TRIBUTE TODAY. MY GOVERNMENT HAS NEVER SEEN HOW SUCH AGREEMENT IS POSSIBLE WITHOUT AN ONGOING, SERIOUS NEGOTIATING PROCESS, EITHER DIRECT OR INDIRECT, WHICH ENGAGES THE PARTIES THEMSELVES.

15. WHAT ARE THE KEY ISSUES WITH WHICH SUCH NEGOTIATIONS MUST COME TO GRIPS? IN SIMPLEST TERMS THEY ARE THE ISSUES OF SOVEREIGNTY AND SECURITY. THE PARTIES MUST FIND A WAY TO RECONCILE THE TWO. MY GOVERNMENT HAS NEVER FELT THAT RECONCILING THESE TWO CONCERNS -- AND THEY ARE EQUALLY VALID CONCERNS -- IS PRIMARILY A QUESTION OF THE LOCATION OF BOUNDARIES, BUT NEITHER HAVE WE FELT THAT THE LOCATION OF BOUNDARIES CAN BE IGNORED IN THIS CONTEXT. THERE ARE MANY STRONGLY HELD VIEWS ABOUT WHERE FINAL BOUNDARIES BETWEEN ISRAEL AND ITS NEIGHBORS SHOULD BE DRAWN. RESOLUTION 242 HAS OFTEN BEEN CITED TO SUPPORT ONE VIEW OR ANOTHER. BUT THE FACT IS THAT RESOLUTION 242 IS SILENT ON THIS QUESTION. IT NEITHER ENDORSES NOR PRECLUDES THE ARMISTICE LINES, WHICH EXISTED BETWEEN ISRAEL, EGYPT, JORDAN AND SYRIA ON JUNE 4, 1967, AS THE FINAL SECURE AND RECOGNIZED BOUNDARIES. EVERYONE KNEW WHEN RESOLUTION 242 WAS APPROVED THAT THIS WAS AN AREA OF AMBIGUITY. THIS WAS PART OF THE COMPROMISE TO WHICH I HAVE REFERRED.

16. IT HAS NEVER BEEN OUR UNDERSTANDING THAT THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF RESOLUTION 242 WAS TO ENDORSE ANY RE-DRAWING OF THE ARMISTICE LINE IN THE

PROCESS OF ESTABLISHING FINAL BOUNDARIES. BUT NEITHER HAS IT BEEN OUR UNDERSTANDING THAT RESOLUTION 242 WAS MEANT TO PRECLUDE ANY CHANGES IN THOSE LINES ON WHICH THE PARTIES COULD AGREE. THE CENTRAL MESSAGE OF

RESOLUTION 242 IS THAT THERE SHOULD BE A FUNDAMENTAL
CHANGE IN THE NATURE OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PARTIES
WITH EACH OTHER, A CHANGE FROM BELLIGERENCY TO PEACE,
FROM INSECURITY TO SECURITY, FROM DISPOSSESSION AND
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 112140

DESPAIR TO HOPE AND DIGNITY FOR THE PALESTINIANS. LET
ME SAY AGAIN: IT SEEMS CLEAR TO US -- LOGICALLY,
POLITICALLY, HISTORICALLY, REALISTICALLY -- THAT THE
QUESTION OF AGREEMENT ON FINAL BOUNDARIES MUST BE VIEWED
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE TOTAL THRUST AND INTENT OF
RESOLUTION 242. THIS QUESTION MUST THEREFORE BE RESOLVED
AS PART OF THE PROCESS OF REACHING AGREEMENT ON ALL THE
COMPLEX FACTORS GOVERNING A NEW RELATIONSHIP AMONG THE
PARTIES, TO REPLACE THAT DEFINED IN THE 1949 ARMISTICE
AGREEMENTS.

17. MR. PRESIDENT, I HAVE RECALLED AT SUCH LENGTH THE
HISTORY OF OUR EFFORTS IN 1967, NOT TO ARGUE THE PAST,
BUT BECAUSE I BELIEVE WE NEED TO RESTORE OUR PERSPECTIVE
AS WE LOOK TO THE FUTURE. MANY SINCERE EFFORTS HAVE
BEEN MADE, BY AMBASSADOR JARRING AND BY GOVERNMENTS,
INCLUDING MY OWN, TO HELP THE PARTIES FIND A MUTUALLY
ACCEPTABLE FRAMEWORK FOR NEGOTIATING THE TERMS OF A
FINAL PEACE AGREEMENT. WHATEVER MAY HAVE BEEN THEIR
MERITS, NONE SUCCEEDED.

18. WE ARE, THEREFORE, LEFT WITH RESOLUTION 242
AS THE ONLY BASIS ACCEPTED BY BOTH SIDES, WITH REGARD
BOTH TO SUBSTANCE AND TO PROCEDURE. THE PRINCIPAL
PARTIES CONCERNED HAVE ACCEPTED THAT BASIS, AND THIS IS
WHAT MAKES IT UNIQUELY IMPORTANT. THE COUNCIL COULD
TRY TO DEVISE A NEW FRAMEWORK OR TO ENLARGE UPON OR
INTERPRET THE EXISTING ONE, BUT THIS WOULD BE TO NO
AVAIL IF WHAT RESULTED WAS NOT ACCEPTABLE TO BOTH SIDES.

19. THE COUNCIL FACES A GREAT RESPONSIBILITY. WE CAN
BY OUR ACTIONS UNDO THE BASIS FOR AGREEMENT WHICH NOW
EXISTS, WITH ALL ITS DELIBERATE AMBIGUITIES, OR WE CAN
PRESERVE THAT BASIS UNCHANGED AND SEEK TO BREATHE NEW
LIFE INTO EFFORTS TO TRANSLATE IT INTO A MEANINGFUL
FINAL SETTLEMENT. MY GOVERNMENT STRONGLY BELIEVES THAT
WE MUST TAKE THE LATTER COURSE.

20. WE WILL BE GUIDED BY THIS APPROACH IN JUDGING
WHATEVER PROPOSALS MAY ULTIMATELY BE PLACED BEFORE US.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 112140

WE AGREE WITH THOSE WHO HAVE ARGUED THAT THE COUNCIL

HAS A RESPONSIBILITY TO HELP BRING ABOUT THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION 242. IMPLEMENTATION
REQUIRES AGREEMENT, AND AGREEMENT REQUIRES A PROCESS
OF NEGOTIATIONS. THIS IS WHAT THE COUNCIL MUST ENCOURAGE
AND FACILITATE. SUCH A PROCESS, IN OUR VIEW, MUST
INVOLVE A PATIENT, PRACTICAL STEP- BY- STEP APPROACH.
IT COULD BEGIN, AS WE HAVE LONG FAVORED, WITH AN AGREEMENT
ON SOME ISRAELI WITHDRAWAL IN SINAI AND MEASURES TO RE-
OPEN THE SUEZ CANAL, AS THE FIRST STAGE ON THE ROAD TO
A FINAL SETTLEMENT. BUT WHETHER A BEGINNING IS MADE IN
THIS OR SOME OTHER WAY, IS LESS IMPORTANT THAN THAT SUCH
A PROCESS BE STARTED. ONCE NEGOTIATIONS IN THE TRUE
SENSE EXIST, MY GOVERNMENT IS PREPARED TO DO ITS PART
TO SEE THAT THEY CONTINUE UNTIL THE GOAL THE COUNCIL
SET FOR ITSELF OVER FIVE AND ONE- HALF YEARS AGO IS
ACHIEVED. RUSH

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 09 JUN 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: collinp0
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973STATE112140
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: NEA: ALATHERTON: KM
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730635/abqcempn.tel
Line Count: 289
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ORIGIN NEA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: collinp0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 21 DEC 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <21-Dec-2001 by shawdg>; APPROVED <22 FEB 2002 by collinp0>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> jms 980206
Subject: DRAFT STATEMENT FOR AMB SCALI
TAGS: PFOR, UN
To: TEHRAN
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005